## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

Sarah Updike, et al.		•		
	<del></del>	:	Case No.	1:22-cv-00374
	Plaintiff(s)	:		
	, ,	:	Judge Mich	nael R. Barrett
V.		:		
Sara Jonas, et al.		:	JOINT DISCOVERY PLAN (RULE 26(f) REPORT)	
	Defendant(s)	:	(REQUIRÈ	,

Now come all parties to this case, by and through their respective counsel, and hereby jointly submit to the Court this Joint Discovery Plan, pursuant to the Court's Trial Procedure Order. The parties conducted their discovery conference on  $\frac{10/11/2023}{}$ .

## A. MAGISTRATE CONSENT

The Parties:

- unanimously consent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (c).
- do not unanimously consent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (c).
- unanimously give contingent consent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (c), for trial purposes only, in the event that the District Judge assigned is unavailable on the date set for trial (e.g. because of other trial settings, civil or criminal).

RUL	E 26(a) DISCLOSURES		
	The parties have exchanged pre-discovery disclosures required by Rule 26(a)(1).		
X	The parties will exchange such disclosures by November 3, 2023		
	The parties are exempt from disclosures under Rule 26(a)(1)(E).		
NOT	Rule 26(a) disclosures are <u>not</u> to be filed with the Court.		
DISC	OVERY ISSUES AND DATES		
1.	Discovery will need to be conducted on the issues of The drafting and passage of the Resolution; actions taken to enforce the Resolution and otherwise		
censor speech/ideas; any justification for passage of the Resolution; standing of parties			
	and nature and extent of damages		
2.	The parties recommend that discovery		
	□ should be bifurcated between liability and damages		
	□ should be bifurcated between factual and expert		
	should be limited in some fashion or focused upon particular issues which relate to		
3.	Disclosure and report of Plaintiff(s) expert(s) byMarch 1, 2024		
4.	Disclosure and report of Defendant(s) expert(s) by April 1, 2024		
5.	Disclosure and report of rebuttal expert(s) by May 1, 2024		
6.	Disclosure of non-expert (fact) witnesses		
7.	Discovery cutoff June 1, 2024		

8.	Anticipated discovery problems				
	Defendants have asserted legislative privilege during depositions; potential issues regarding				
	claims of executive session privilege and/or attorney-client privilege  □ None				
9.	Describe the subjects on which discovery is to be sought and the nature,				
extent and so	cope of discovery that each party needs to: (1) make a settlement evaluation,				
(2) prepare fo	or case dispositive motions, and (3) prepare for trial:				
The drafting o	of the Resolution; actions taken to enforce the Resolution and/or censor speech/ideas; any				
justification fo	or the Resolution; standing of parties and nature and extent of damages				
10.	Discovery of Electronically Stored Information. The parties have				
discussed di	sclosure, discovery, and preservation of electronically stored information,				
including the	form or forms in which it should be produced.				
x	Yes				
	No				
i. The	parties have electronically stored information in the following formats:				
Emails, text m	essages, pdfs, social media messages and posts, documents saved in Google drive				
ii. The	case presents the following issues relating to disclosure, discovery, or				
prese	vation of electronically stored information, including the form or forms in				
which	it should be produced:				
None at this time					

11. Claims of Privilege or Protection. The parties have discussed issues	
regarding the protection of information by a privilege or the work-product doctrine,	
including whether the parties agree to a procedure to assert these claims after production	วท
or have any other agreements under Fed. R. Evid. 502.	
Yes	
x No	
i. The case presents the following issues relating to claims of privilege or of	
protection as trial preparation materials:  Defendants have asserted legislative privilege during depositions; issues concerning executive session	
privilege and attorney-client privilege may also arise	
ii. Have the parties agreed on a procedure to assert such claims AFTER production?	
x No	
Yes	
Yes, and the parties ask that the Court include the following agreement	in
the scheduling order:	

## D. <u>LIMITATIONS ON DISCOVERY</u>

	1.	Chan	nges in the limitations on discovery				
			Extension of time limitations (currently one day of seven hours) in				
			taking of depositions to				
		X	Extension of number of depositions (currently 10) permitted to				
			Extension of number of interrogatories (currently 25) to				
			□ Other:				
			None				
E.	PRO1	ΓECTI\	/E ORDER				
	×	A pro	A protective order will likely be submitted to the Court on or before				
			11/3/23 				
		The p	parties currently do not anticipate the need for a protective order. If the				
		partie	es subsequently deem that one is necessary, they will submit a joint				
		propo	osed order to the Court. Such order will be in compliance with Procter &				
		Gaml	ble Co. v. Bankers Trust Co., 78 F. 3d 219 (6th Cir. 1996).				
F.	SETT	LEME	<u>NT</u>				
	A sett	lement	t demand hasx has not been made.				
	A resp	esponse has has not been made.					
	A den	nand c	d can be made by				
	A resp	ponse	can be made by				

G.	MOTION DEADLINES				
	1.	Motion to amend the pleadings and	February 1, 2024		
	2.	Motions relative to the pleadings by	March 1, 2024		
	3.	Dispositive motions by August 1, 20	24		
н.	OTHE	ER MATTERS PERTINENT TO MAN	AGEMENT OF TH	IIS LITIGATION	
None	at this ti	me			
Signatures:		s/Nicole M. Lundrigan	s/Bernard Wharton		
		Attorney for Plaintiff(s) A	torney for Defend	ant(s)	
			/Lisa Hesse		